

REMARKS

Claims 43-62 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1-42 have been canceled. New claims 43-62 have been added.

Applicants' representative thanks Examiner Kasraian for the courtesies extended during the teleconference held on September 15, 2009, with Keith Drabek. During the teleconference, Applicants' representative presented claim language regarding independent claims 43 and 52 - Examiner Kasraian agreed that such claim language is directed to the originally claimed invention.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 8, and 14 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 8, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason: the rejection of claims 1, 8, and 14 is moot in light of the cancellation of claims 1-22.

II. Rejection of Claims 1, 3, and 7-9 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 3, and 7-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Rogalski *et al.* (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0141484) and Kallio (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0147008). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons: the rejection of claims 1, 3, and 7-9 is moot in light of the cancellation of claims 1-22, and Rogalski *et al.* and Kallio, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every feature recited in the subject claims.

The subject application is generally directed to operating mobile devices over regulated and unregulated wireless networks. To this end, new independent claim 43 recites *a system for providing voice and data services over a wired data network and a regulated wireless network comprising a first wireless network including at least one wireless access point wired to the wired data network, the at least one wireless access point provides wireless access to the wired data network via an unregulated wireless connection; and at least one digital cordless handset for servicing at least one of an outgoing or an incoming call associated with a telephone number of a subscriber via the unregulated wireless connection, the regulated wireless network services the at least one of the outgoing or the incoming call using the telephone*

number. (Support for this element can be found at, *e.g.*, paragraphs [0021] and [0052]-[0073] of Applicants' specification).

Rogalski *et al.* disclose transmitting voice data over a 802.11b interface. (*See, e.g.*, Rogalski *et al.* at paragraph [0078]). Kallio discloses a mobile station that roams between a Global System for Mobile communication (GSM) network and a wireless local area network (WLAN). (*See, e.g.*, Kallio at paragraph [0010]). Applicants' representative respectfully submits that Rogalski *et al.* and Kallio fail to teach or suggest ***a first wireless network including at least one wireless access point wired to the wired data network, the at least one wireless access point provides wireless access to the wired data network via an unregulated wireless connection; and at least one digital cordless handset for servicing at least one of an outgoing or an incoming call associated with a telephone number of a subscriber via the unregulated wireless connection, the regulated wireless network services the at least one of the outgoing or the incoming call using the telephone number***, as recited in claim 43. Instead, Rogalski *et al.* merely disclose supporting voice communications over a WLAN (*see, e.g.*, Rogalski *et al.* paragraph [0038]); and Kallio merely discloses a mobile station serves as a user's interface with the GSM network and the WLAN. (*See, e.g.*, Kallio at paragraph [0024]).

Further, for similar reasons, Rogalski *et al.* and Kallio fail to teach or suggest ***the regulated wireless network comprises a cellular telephone network***, as recited in new dependent claim 49. (Support for this element can be found at, *e.g.*, paragraphs [0019] and [0021] of Applicants' specification).

Moreover, new dependent claim 50 recites ***the regulated wireless network services the at least one of the outgoing or the incoming call via a wireless telephone***, and at least the same reasons presented above with respect to claim 43 apply similarly to claim 50. (Support for this element can be found at, *e.g.*, paragraphs [0021], [0023], and [0041] of Applicants' specification).

In addition, new dependent claim 51 recites ***the at least one digital cordless handset and the wireless telephone produce a sound when the at least one of the outgoing or the incoming call is activated based on the telephone number***. (Support for this element can be found at, *e.g.*, paragraph [0057] of Applicants' specification). It is respectfully submitted that Rogalski *et al.* and Kallio fail to teach or suggest ***the at least one digital cordless handset and the wireless telephone produce a sound when the at least one of the outgoing or the incoming call is***

activated based on the telephone number, as recited in claim 51. Rather, Rogalski *et al.* and Kallio merely disclose communication over a wireless network using one mobile device. (See, e.g., Rogalski *et al.* paragraph [0038]; see, e.g., Kallio at paragraph [0024]).

Further, new independent claim 52 recites *a method of providing at least one of a voice or a data service over a wired data network and a regulated wireless network*, comprising *detecting a digital cordless handset in range of a wireless access point via an unregulated wireless connection, the wireless access point is coupled to the wired data network; providing information of at least one subscriber of the at least one of the voice or the data service via the wired data network; servicing a call based on a telephone number associated with the at least one subscriber via the digital cordless handset and the wired data network, the call serviced via the digital cordless handset based on digital cordless handset identity information associated with the at least one subscriber and included in the information; and servicing the call based on the telephone number via a wireless telephone and the wired data network using the regulated wireless network when the call is answered via the wireless telephone*. In this regard, at least the same reasons presented above with respect to claim 43 apply similarly to claim 52.

Moreover, for similar reasons, Rogalski *et al.* and Kallio fail to teach or suggest *the regulated wireless network comprises a cellular telephone network, the wireless telephone serviced by the cellular telephone network*, as recited in new dependent claim 58. (Support for this element can be found at, e.g., paragraphs [0021], [0023], and [0041] of Applicants' specification).

In addition, new independent claim 59 recites *a system for providing voice and data services via a wired data network and a regulated wireless network*, comprising *a broadband residential gateway that provides a communications link to at least one wired network device over a local wired network; a wireless access point that provides wireless access to the wired data network over an unregulated wireless connection, the wired data network provides information of at least one subscriber associated with the voice and data services; at least one digital cordless handset that services a call associated with a telephone number of the at least one subscriber via the unregulated wireless connection when the call is answered via the at least one digital cordless handset; and a cellular phone that services the call via the regulated wireless network when the call is answered*

via the cellular phone. In this regard, at least the same reasons presented above with respect to claim 52 apply similarly to claim 59.

III. Rejection of Claims 4-6 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 4-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Rogalski *et al.*, Kallio, and Back (U.S. Patent No. 6,081,726). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason: the rejection of claims 4-6 is moot in light of the cancellation of claims 1-22.

IV. Rejection of Claims 10-13 and 22 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 10-12 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Rogalski *et al.*, Kallio, and Moore, Jr. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0039242). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason: the rejection of claims 10-13 and 22 is moot in light of the cancellation of claims 1-22.

V. Rejection of Claims 14-21 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 14-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Jones *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,404,764), Rogalski *et al.*, and Kallio. This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason: the rejection of claims 14-21 is moot in light of the cancellation of claims 1-22.

CONCLUSION

Applicants' representative submits this paper addresses all of the rejections set forth in the Office communication, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of all stated rejections. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [ATTWP290USB].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

TUROC & WATSON, LLP

/Keith E. Drabek/

Keith E. Drabek
Reg. No. 60,757

TUROC & WATSON, LLP
127 Public Square
57TH Floor, Key Tower
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731